REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-31 were originally pending. Claims 12, 19, and 26 were amended. Claims 17 and 25 were canceled without prejudice. No claims were added. Accordingly, claims 1-16, 18- 24 and 26-31 are currently pending In view of these claim amendments and the following remarks, withdrawal of all outstanding actions objections and rejections to the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Claim 12 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. Claim 17 has been canceled as a duplicate of claim 16. Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate features of claim 25. which has been canceled. Claim 26 has been amended to more clearly indicate that the user interface includes "the first area in a web page for displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device". The amendment to claim 26 does not add any additional features for consideration that require a new search, especially in view of the previously pending subject matter (e.g., please see claims 1 and 10).

Claim Objections

Claims 12, 16, and 17 stand objected-to because of claim informalities.

Claim 12 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. In view of this amendment, withdrawal of the objection to claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 has been canceled as a duplicate of claim 16. In view of this amendment, withdrawal of the objection to claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,142 Strahorn et al ("Strahorn"). These rejections are traversed.

Claim 1 recites:

- "receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type",

- "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page", "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", and

- "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation".

In addressing claim 1, the Action admits that Strahorn does not teach or suggest "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", and "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation". Attempting to arrive at these missing features, and without pointing to any other reference, the Examiner modifies Strahorn to assert that such modification would have been obvious to want of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to arrive at the features of claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

14

Strahorn at column 2, lines 1-31, teaches that a server stores HTML-based pages that can be served to a client computer and displayed by the client computer in a browser. Strahorn teaches that one of the pages served to the client computer contains links to a program to generate a child window to display a miniaturized rasterized depiction (i.e., "preferably not a web page", column 4, line 33-34) of an active page. Strahorn at column 4, lines 8-46, teaches that the program used to generate the child window is retrieved from the server responsive to a user selecting "a hyperlinked help button". The client computer-based browser or operating system runs the program that was downloaded from the server. This program that is executing on the client computer monitors the web page that is being displayed by the browser executing on the client computer to update the child window so that the child window depicts the web page and presents any corresponding help information accordingly. Strahorn at column 3, lines 8 through 12, indicates that the displayed help information is text that is downloaded from the server.

In view of the above, it is very clear that Strahorn does not teach or suggest "responsive to receiving the request for the context-sensitive help, the first computer", "determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page", "generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information", and "providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation", as claim 1 recites. Instead, Strahorn plainly teaches that a user downloads web pages from a server, and responsive to a user selecting a hyperlink button that has the words "Help" displayed, that the user's computer since a request to download a computer program to the server. The requested computer program is downloaded from the server to the user's computer. Then the

15

1 user's computer executes the downloaded program to present a rasterized version

2 of the active web page along with corresponding text-based help information.

3 Clearly, these express teachings of Strahorn are completely silent with

4 respect to the features of claim 1. Additionally, there are is no teaching or

5 suggestion supplied by Strahorn to modify Strahorn to arrive at features that the

6 Action concedes as missing from Strahorn. Strahorn explicitly teaches that the

7 child window generated at the user computer by a program executing on the user's

8 computer is "merely a rasterized depiction of the active web page" and "preferably

9 not a web page". Again, Strahorn explicitly indicates this preference for the

10 depiction not to be a web page. One likely reason for this is because **it is the**

11 **computer program executing on the user's computer** that determines the

12 contents of the active web page and maps it to text-based help information

13 provided by the server to generate a bitmap of the active web page for presentation

14 on the user computer, **not the server**. In view of this, Applicant respectfully

15 submits that the Actions modification to Strahorn, a modification that is not

16 supported by the Action with any other prior art reference or teaching, to change

17 the operation of the computer program executing on the user's computer to

18 generate a web page rather than a rasterized depiction of the active web page --

19 especially in view of Strahorn to express teachings of the contrary -- is highly

20 unlikely.

21 Even in view of the unlikelihood of such a modification, modification to

22 Strahorn's computer-program executing on a user computer still does not teach or

23 suggest that the server of Strahorn (i.e., not the computer program running on the

24 user's computer) generates, responsive to receiving a request for context-sensitive

25 help, web pages that comprise context-sensitive information for presentation by

16

the user computer. Thus, Strahorn in view of the unsupported modification to Strahorn does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. If a combination of references does not teach or suggest each and every element of a claim, the claimed features are not obvious over the combination of references.

Accordingly, and at least for these reasons, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

As an additional matter, to provide a missing feature of Strahorn, the Action seemingly relies on personal knowledge without pointing to any specific teaching or suggestion from another prior art reference to modify Strahorn in a manner that is directly contrary to an explicit preference disclosed by Strahorn. Specifically, responsive to Strahorn's explicit teaching that the computer program executing on a user's computer **generate a rasterized depiction of a active web page** that is being presented by a browser on the user's computer, **wherein the depiction is "preferably not a web page"** (column 4, lines 33-35), the Action asserts that it would have been obvious for the computer-program executing on the user's computer to have generated a web page instead. Clearly, this is not supported by the express teachings of Strahorn -- especially when Strahorn explicitly teaches against such a modification. (For the reasons already discussed, this unsupported modification to Strahorn still does not teach or suggest the features of claim 1-- it is just not a supported modification). Strahorn does not indicate why this modification is not desired. However, since the computer-program executing on the user's computer is described as a "Java application or applet" (Abstract), not a server of web pages to another computer, it is likely that Strahorn did not believe that such a modification would serve any useful purpose.

According to 37 CFR §1.104(d)(2), "[w]hen a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons." In view of the above, if this modification of Strahorn is maintained on a similar basis in a subsequent action, the Examiner is respectfully requested to supply such an affidavit subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons to support this otherwise unsupported modification to Strahorn.

Claims 2-9 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, for these reasons alone, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 2-9 is respectfully requested.

Claim 10 recites:

• "providing context-sensitive help for a Web-based user interface (UI) of a first computer to a second computer",

• "receiving a request for a set of context sensitive help corresponding to a Web-based UI of the first computer, the request being received at the first computer, the Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object and corresponding to one or more functions of the first computer, the Web-based UI being presented on the second computer, the first computer being operatively coupled to the second computer over a network, the context-sensitive help answering a 'What is the user-interface object?' or a 'Why would I use the user-interface object?' question type", and

- "responsive to receiving the request, the first computer: generating a second Web page comprising the context-sensitive help" and "communicating the second Web page to the second computer for presentation."

For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, Strahorn in view of the unsupported modification to Strahorn does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 11-18 should be withdrawn.

Claims 19-31 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strahorn in view of US patent number 6,667,747 to Spellman et al. ("Spellman"). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 19 recites in part:

- "communicating the Web based UI to a different system for presentation", "responsive to receiving a request for context sensitive help, determining a set of context-sensitive help that corresponds to the Web-based UI, the Web-based UI comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help requesting a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" answer type",

- "encapsulating the context sensitive help into a Web page that is compatible with a platform of the different system", and

- "communicating the context-sensitive help embedded in the web page to the different system for presentation."

19

In addressing claim 19, the Action admits that Strahorn does not teach or suggest "communicating the context-sensitive help to the different system for presentation". Attempting to arrive at these missing features, the Action modifies Strahorn in view of the teachings of Spellman (column 6, lines 23-36, column 7, lines 14-20, and column 8, lines 23-35), which describe that two independent applications may utilize incompatible data and/or formats, and that a macro can be used to convert incompatible program data/parameters to compatible program data/parameters. Applicant respectfully submits that Strahorn in view of these teachings of Spellman do not teach or suggest the features of claim 19 as a whole for the following reasons.

Strahorn at column 2, lines 1-31, teaches that a server communicates HTML documents to a client computer for display by a browser. Strahorn also teaches at column 3, lines 8 through 12, of the server may also communicate text-based help information to the browser for display in a rasterized depiction of a displayed web page. For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, communicating HTML documents and text-based help information to a client computer does not teach or suggest the above recited features of claim 19. Modifying the system of Strahorn with the cited portions of Spellman, and Spellman as a whole, does not cure these deficiencies of the primary reference Strahorn. Accordingly, the cited combination does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 19. As such, claim 19 is not obvious over Strahorn in view of Spellman.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Claims 20-25 depend from claim 19 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 20-25 is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 recites in part;

- "[a] user interface comprising [...]a first area in a web page for displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device the remote UI comprising a user-interface object", and

- "a second area within the first area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context sensitive help to answer a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type."

For the reasons already discussed above with respect to claim 1, the cited combination of Strahorn in view of Spellman does not teach or suggest these claimed features.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the 35 §USC §103(a) rejection of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

Claims 27-31 depend from claim 26 and are allowable over the cited combination at least by virtue of this dependency. Accordingly, withdrawal of the respective 35 USC §103(a) rejections of claims 27-31 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

The pending claims are in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Should any issue remain that prevents allowance of the

application, the Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned prior or issuance

of a subsequent Office action.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 01/10/2006   By: _Brian Hart_____
                                        Brian G. Hart
                                        Reg. No. 44,421
                                        (509) 324-9256

22